

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: August 15, 2000
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of August 10, 2000

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member (P)
Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member (P)
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member (A)
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member (A)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

(P) Primary (A) Alternate

Public:

Foster Church	The Oregonian
Ken Hadley	CCAR
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Home Builders Association
Tom Jacobs	Cascade SE Neighborhood Association
Mark Mead	J.D. White & Company
Neil Olsen	Clark County Home Builders Association
Scott Patterson	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm
Bud Van Cleve	NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director

Tamara DeRidder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Director
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Gordy Euler	Clark County Long Range Planning
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	Clark County Long Range Planning
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Elise Scolnick	Clark County Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Brian Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development

Introductions / Roll Call

Called to order at 4:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Approve July 27th Steering Committee Notes

Commissioner Stanton had a question on page 4 regarding which Comprehensive Plan is being referred to in the notes. Bob Higbie indicates that the notes are referring to the 1994 Comprehensive Plan.

Continued review of 60-40 Single Family – Multi-family new units ration policy and 6-16 Single Family – Multi-family density policy

Jeanne Harris has two comments looking at the region as a whole. It could be problematic if higher density is only in the central parts of the region and lower as you get out further. If we pursue 60-40 there might be affordability problems. John Idsinga responds by saying that 60-40 is not currently working in Battle Ground. He wants to have individual goals for each jurisdiction. Battle Ground has a vacancy problem with existing multifamily units and more units are not currently needed.

Jack Burkman says that it is a market factor problem. By holding the goal out there the jurisdictions should provide the tools and incentives to meet the goal. Commissioner Pridemore points out that there should be a focus on the long-term picture. He says that the theory is easier to see come to fruition in the long-term.

Eric Holmes says that the zoning requires multifamily units in multifamily zones. This can be restrictive to development. Eric Eisemann says multifamily zoning in Ridgefield is stagnant. The economic drivers are not there to push occupancy of multifamily units. He questions at what point jurisdictions are accountable to the policy goals. Is it at 5,

10 or 20 years? Commissioner Pridemore responds by saying that if the zoning is changed the appropriate lands will not be available in 20 years when they are needed.

Mary Kufeldt-Antle says that affordability should not be seen as synonymous with density. They are not necessarily the same. It is difficult to balance the future needs with the current situation. Do we want affordability or density? Commissioner Pridemore responds by saying both are necessary. Affordable is not necessarily meant to be subsidized, but affordable to a broad range of County residents. It is also necessary to look at the goal of wanting distinctly separated city centers. Density is a necessary goal when you look at fitting the projected populations into a finite amount of space.

Jack Burkman wants a mix of housing choices, not just density. What is being built should be a mix within each jurisdiction. What was the intent of 60-40? Mary Kufeldt-Antle says one of the goals was to let communities develop how they want to develop. Community members do not want mandates that are handed down by outsiders. Commissioner Pridemore states that there is a desire to let jurisdictions do what they want to do, but all need to be aware that the type of growth that takes place has an impact on other jurisdictions. Density may not be the same in all jurisdictions, but there should be trade-offs between communities that obtain higher densities and those that do not reach as high of densities.

Jack Burkman says that it must be remembered that there are guidelines from the Hearings Board.

Jay Cervený states that he likes the goal of density over the 60-40 housing split goal. Commissioner Pridemore says that the goals are linked. Jeanne Harris is still unclear on the target. Are we planning for density or population? Commissioner Pridemore responds that there is a need to plan for the projected population numbers in a specified amount of space. That is where the issues start to play out. Sprawl is the baseline issue and the reason for planning.

John Idsinga again questions affordability within the urban growth boundaries.

Commissioner Stanton brings up issue of infrastructure to serve the housing and states that land is only a part of the equation.

Mary Kufeldt-Antle has questions about the 40 percent of housing being rental. Commissioner Pridemore responded that it is not his understanding that the 40 percent is to be rental, but that it is to be multifamily. Eric Eisemann says the tenure of housing

is also an issue. There is a need to separate tenure and density in the goals. By breaking the issues down into discrete components they are more manageable and attainable.

Rich Lowry speaks to the remand from the Hearings Board. The Hearings Board referred to both affordability and density.

Commissioner Pridemore asks the members how they can come to compromises between their jurisdictions? Jack Burkman responds by saying that you cannot isolate each individual jurisdiction. Jeanne Harris says that they are now getting to the point where jobs are catching up with housing and she is concerned about the smaller jurisdictions keeping land available of multifamily units for the future.

Jack Burkman suggests that staff refine the policy paper and bring some policy options back to the Steering Committee. Bob Higbie states that the TAC has been having similar conversations to the Steering Committee's discussion. The 60-40 policy can have many different approaches, particularly pertaining to the density and multifamily issues.

Commissioner Pridemore asks what policy will get us to the goals. Rich Carson says staff can present the different scenarios. Jack Burkman would like a pro and con position on the different possible approaches.

Commissioner Pridemore wants to know what points the jurisdictions are willing to compromise on. What are communities willing to give up in exchange for other goals? He suggests that the issue be put on hold for 3-4 sessions. Other discussions might have impact on this issue. Mary Kufeldt-Antle would like an e-mail update on the TAC discussions of this issue.

Review 75% Residential and Commercial land and 50% Industrial Land Consumption Policies.

Bob Higbie reviews this issue. The original plan showed that UGBs would not be moved until 75 percent of the Residential and Commercial land and 50 percent of the industrial lands are developed. A 25-year supply was the original land area included (i.e. a 25% market factor of land was included in the UGA's). Now 5 years into the plan we are not at the numbers to expand yet. That may be different if we look at the higher, current population projections beyond the current plan's 2012 planning period.

Rich Lowry says that the 1994 plan was appealed and the 1st remand said the UGAs were at maximum size. The 2nd remand said that it was not good enough. The 5-year review role is the result of this process and that is in code and was upheld by the Hearings Board. The 75 percent rule is fairly solid and the 5-year review to move can be more flexible, but it is not likely that the 5-year period is too short. Also, if 75-50 is changed we would have to backfill with other policies to slow movement of the UGBs. Other statute stops from moving unless there is a revisit to the underlying assumptions.

Commissioner Pridemore says that with current factors there is no movement, overall, of the UGBs. Are there other methods that should be used to measure this? If we were at 75 percent then the 60-40 is relevant. However, now it is a moot point because we have not met the 75 percent which would create a need to expand.

Rich Lowry says that it would be a good idea to look at pre-planning for what lands to bring into the UGA's next when that is necessary. The population numbers will allow you to know how much land will be needed in the future.

John Idsinga asks about reaching the 75 percent and how that relates to capital facilities? Rich Lowry responds that the capital facilities will be based on the new 20-year estimates. Jack Burkman asks about the market factor role and the 75- 50 rule. Commissioner Pridemore says it is part of the calculation but will not be changed at this point. Rich Lowry says the 25 percent market factor is based on the 75 percent so there is not an artificial increase in costs.

Jeanne Harris asks if the total land calculation is based on buildable lands in the UBB or is it all lands. Rich Lowry said the numbers are based on net acres of buildable land from the 1994 analysis. Rich Carson says that urban reserves help capital improvement planning. Commissioner Pridemore says the definition of urban reserves is still not well defined and needs work. Even if higher population numbers are used it will still not change the status of the 75 percent. Jack Burkman says this is a good reason not to change the policy.

Commissioner Pridemore says there will be another opportunity to revisit this issue at the Planning Commission and at the Board.

Mary Kufeldt-Antle wants to look at the Urban Reserve issue. Commissioner Pridemore says it will be discussed.

Technical Advisory Committee Update

Bob Higbie stated that there were three main issues discussed:

- 1) school siting was looked at and will be reviewed at the next meeting;
- 2) population and employment projections and working on allocation methodologies; and,
- 3) Senate Bill 6094 dealing with density and county wide planning policies.

Rich Carson suggests that the planning horizons and urban reserves may want to be separated from the Comprehensive Plan discussion because it is a big issue. Commissioner Pridemore questions if it is a good idea to separate the issues.

Adjourn

Adjourn at 5:10

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - august 10 2000.doc